Fax: (702) 382-1169

(702) 382-1170

Tel:

810 S. Casino Center Blvd., #104

LARSON & STEPHENS

Case 10-19402-lbr Doc 185 Entered 03/02/11 11:09:07 Page 1 of 10

Case 10-19402-lbr Doc 185 Entered 03/02/11 11:09:07 Page 2 of 10

810 S. Casino Center Blvd., Suite 104 Las Vegas, Nevada 89101 Tel: (702) 382-1170 Fax: (702) 382-1169

LARSON & STEPHENS

31, 2010 (Doc. No. 171) (the "Lobel Fee Application").

Memorandum of Points and Authorities

Introduction

This Debtor filed his bankruptcy petition commencing this case on May 21, 2010. The

Committee was appointed on August 13, 2010. The status of the bankruptcy case is as follows:

- On July 30, 2010, the Debtor filed his original Plan of Reorganization (Doc. No. 68), and Disclosure Statement (Doc. No. 71). The Plan provided for payment of a maximum 2.47% of unsecured claims, while allowing the Debtor to retain ownership of his operating businesses.
- On September 27, 2010, the Committee filed its Objection to the Disclosure Statement (Doc. No. 99) (the "Objection"). As pointed out in the Objection, the Disclosure Statement is inadequate in many respects, while the Plan suffers from various fatal legal infirmities, including the violation of the absolute priority rule. The Plan also improperly provides for a waiver of creditors' rights under § 1127(e), and conflicts with the deferred discharge provisions of § 1141(d)(5)(A).
- On November 1, 2010, the Debtor filed his Amended Plan of Reorganization (Doc. No. 108) (the "Amended Plan"), and his Amended Disclosure Statement (Doc. No. 109) (the "Amended Disclosure Statement"). Although the Amended Plan and Amended Disclosure Statement contain certain changes from the originals, the legal infirmities of the Plan have not been remedied, and the Committee believes that the Amended Disclosure Statement still fails to contain adequate information.
- On November 5, 2010, the Committee filed a Motion for Appointment of An Examiner in the case (Doc. No. 114) (the "Examiner Motion"). The Debtor opposed that motion on November 24, 2010 (Doc. No. 142).
- The hearings on the Amended Disclosure Statement and Examiner Motion have been continued to April 6, 2011 (Doc. No. 160).
- On February 11, 2011, the Lobel Fee Application was filed, requesting approval of fees and costs through December 31, 2010, in an amount of \$180,298.94.
- On February 14, 2011, the Debtor filed an Application to Employ RSM McGladrey as Accountant for the Estate (Doc. No. 176).
- On February 22, 2011, the Committee filed an Application to Employ Development Specialists, Inc., as Financial Consultants (Doc. No. 179). The Committee hopes that this firm will provide the necessary financial review and analysis for its purposes in this case, although it has reserved its rights to continue to seek the appointment of an examiner.
- According to the most recent interim operating report in this case for December 2010, the total cash available to the estate as of December 31, 2010, is \$175,189.00 (Doc. No. 158).

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

The Committee objects to the Lobel Fee Application for the reason and upon the grounds that the amount of the fees and expenses requested are excessive with regard to the current status of the case and the current value to the estate of those services. The hourly rates of the Debtor's attorneys also appear to significantly exceed market rates. In addition, the Committee objects to the Lobel Fee Application on the grounds that there does not appear to be sufficient cash or other liquid assets available for payment of those fees without jeopardizing the ability to pay other administrative claims in this case, including Committee counsel, the Committee's financial consultant, the proposed accountant for the Debtor, and/or the respective local counsel for the Committee and the Debtor. For these reasons, the Committee respectfully requests that the approval of the Lobel Fee Application be denied at this time.

Argument

A fee applicant bears the burden of establishing entitlement to compensation and its reasonableness. In re Smith, 317 F3d 918, 928 (9th Cir. 2002). Bankruptcy courts have the obligation to ensure that the fees awarded are reasonable. In re Circle K Corp., 294 B.R. 111, 114 (9th Cir. B.A.P. 2001) ("[A] court should award fees only to the level proven to be actual, necessary and reasonable."), citing In re CIC Inv. Corp., 192 B.R. 549, 545 (9th Cir. B.A.P. 1996); see also, In re Public Service Co. of N.H., 86 B.R. 7, 11 (Bankr. D. N.H. 1988) ("the ultimate standard is whether the final fee award is in fact an award of a 'reasonable fee' in the circumstances of a particular"). To that end, fee applications must be reviewed to eliminate excessive charges, unproductive time, duplication of services and effort, and services rendered in connection with the debtor's business. In re ACT Mfg., Inc., 281 B.R. 468, 479-80 (Bankr. D.

¹ The accrued fees and costs of Committee counsel through February 28, 2011, is approximately \$52,878.48.

Case 10-19402-lbr Doc 185 Entered 03/02/11 11:09:07 Page 4 of 10

Mass. 2002). Section 330(a)(4)(A) specifically prohibits the allowance of compensation for:

810 S. Casino Center Blvd., Suite 104
 Las Vegas, Nevada 89101
 Tel: (702) 382-1170 Fax: (702) 382-1169

LARSON & STEPHENS

- (i) unnecessary duplication of services; or
- (ii) services that were not -
- (I) reasonably likely to benefit the debtor's estate; or
- (II) necessary to the administration of the case.

The Lobel Fee Application requests approval of \$54,939.00 in fees for "Case Administration," consisting generally of assistance with preparation of the Schedules and Statement of Affairs, compliance with US Trustee requirements, and various activities in connection with administrative matters. The Committee believes that this amount is clearly excessive on its face. There have been no significant administrative activities in the case to date to justify such a large amount of fees. Even the relative complex nature of the Debtor's asset structure would not justify such an amount, given that the attorneys at the Lobel firm had already worked extensively with the Debtor in the preparation of a liquidation analysis and efforts to reach a consensual reorganization with the Debtor's major creditors prior to the filing of the petition, for which the Lobel firm received a retainer in the aggregate amount of \$599,880.77, which had been reduced as of the petition date to \$77,629.47.²

Likewise, the Lobel Fee Application requests allowance and payment of \$16,626.00 for fees relating to the preparation of the application for appointment of the Lobel firm, review of periodic billing statements, and additional time that should have been accounted for in the Case Administration category. Applications for employment as counsel are routine matters that are

² Declaration of James E. Till, Esq. (Doc. No. 42), ¶¶ 8 and 10. According to ¶ 9 of the Till declaration, the Lobel firm incurred fees and costs of \$237,778.30 prior to the filing of the petition. Unless that figure is inaccurate, there is no explanation for the reported remaining amount of the retainer, since the difference between \$599,880.77 and \$237,778.30 would have left a remaining retainer of \$362,102.47 (rather than \$77,629.47).

Case 10-19402-lbr Doc 185 Entered 03/02/11 11:09:07 Page 9

810 S. Casino Center Blvd., Suite 104
 Las Vegas, Nevada 89101
 Tel: (702) 382-1170 Fax: (702) 382-1169

LARSON & STEPHENS

23

24

25

26

27

28

1

2

3

4

5

typically based on existing forms, and do not justify such a significant expenditure of time or effort. Similarly, a review of monthly fee statements hardly seems compensable as professional services.

The Lobel Fee Application further requests allowance and payment of \$85,189.70 relating to the two versions of the Plan and Disclosure Statement. The Committee believes, at the present time, that such fees and costs are objectionable because both versions of the Plan have been unconfirmable as a matter of law, and because there has been no showing of anything approaching that level of value to the estate for such services and costs. See In re Gire, 107 B.R. 739, 748 (Bankr. E.D. Cal. 1989) (fees reduced for failed plan); In re Condor Systems, Inc., 203 Bankr. LEXIS 1784 (N.D. Cal. 2003) (substantial reduction in fees for pursuit of plan that was ultimately abandoned, based on belief that some of counsel's work might have some residual value); In re Dimas, LLC, 357 B.R. 563 (Bankr, N.D. Cal. 2006) (no compensation for drafting documents that were withdrawn); In re Auto Parts Club, Inc., 224 B.R. 445, 451 (Bankr. S.D. Cal. 1998) (seventy-five percent reduction for motion that was withdrawn); In re-Pro Snax Dist., Inc., 157 F.3d 414, 425 (5th Cir. 1998) (lack of likely success in proposing plan must be considered in awarding of fees; bankruptcy court must "strongly consider" debtor's lack of success in pursuing plan confirmation and evaluating fees); In re Kohl, 95 F.3d 713, 714-715 (8th Cir. 1996) (fee is denied where counsel knew or should have known reorganization plans will not be successful); In re Kile, 345 B.R. 182, 190 (Bankr D. Ariz. 2006) (court allowed de minimis fees for failed reorganization). Moreover, filing a facially unconfirmable plan, and pursuit of such plan, is grounds for denial of fees. See In re Ahead Communication Sys., Inc., 395 B.R. 512, 520 (D. Conn. 2008); In re Office Products of America, Inc., 136 B.R. 983, 990-991 (Bankr. W.D. Tex. 1992); In re Lederman Ent., Inc., 997 F.2d 1321,1323-24 (10th Cir. 1993).

Case 10-19402-lbr Doc 185 Entered 03/02/11 11:09:07 Page 6 of 10

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

27

28

810 S. Casino Center Blvd., Suite 104

Tel: (702) 382-1170

LARSON & STEPHENS

In addition, based upon the Debtor's current cash position, even if the Court allows any of the fees and costs included within the Lobel Fee Application at this time, payment of such fees and costs should only be permitted to the extent that they will not impair the Debtor's ability to pay other administrative claims, when and if they are allowed in this case.

Conclusion

For all of the foregoing reasons, the Committee respectfully requests that the Lobel Fee Application be denied at this time, or, in the event that the Court determines to allow some portion of the fees and costs at this time on an interim basis, and subject to disgorgement, that they be limited to the amount of the remaining retainer (reported at \$77,629.47) held by the Lobel firm, together with such other and further relief as the Court may deem just and proper.

DATED: March 1, 2011.

LARSON & STEPHENS

By:/s/ Zachariah Larson, Esq., Bar No. 7787
Zachariah Larson, Esq., Bar No. 7787
810 S. Casino Center Blvd., Suite 104
Las Vegas, Nevada 89101

and

Richard M. Lorenzen
PERKINS COIE BROWN & BAIN P.A.
2901 North Central Avenue, Suite 2000
Phoenix, Arizona 85012-2788
Telephone: 602.351.8000
Facsimile: 602.648.7000

Email: RLorenzen@perkinscoie.com

Douglas R. Pahl
PERKINS COIE LLP
1120 NW Couch Street, 10th Floor
Portland, Oregon 97209
DPahl@perkinscoie.com
Telephone: 503-727-2087

		Case 10-19402-lbr	Doc 185	Entered 03/02/11 11:09:07	Page 7 of 10
I.ARSON & STEPHENS 810 S. Casino Center Blvd., Suite 104 Las Vegas, Nevada 89101 Tel: (702) 382-1170 Fax: (702) 382-1169	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	Case 10-19402-lbr	Doc 185	Facsimile: 504 346-20 Email: DPahl@perkins	87
	27 28				
•				7	

	1	<u>CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE</u>					
	2	1. On this <u>2nd</u> day of March, 2011, I served the following document(s) (specify):					
	3	OBJECTION TO FIRST INTERIM APPLICATION OF THE LOBEL FIRM, LLP,					
	4	REORGANIZATION COUNSEL TO THE DEBTOR AND DEBTOR-IN- POSSESSION FOR COMPENSATION FOR THE PERIOD FROM MAY 22, 2010 THROUGH DECEMBER 31, 2010					
	5	•					
	6	2. I served the above-named document(s) by the following means to the persons as listed below:					
	7	(check all that apply)					
	8	a. ECF System (You must attach the "Notice of Electronic Filing", or list					
	9	all persons and addresses and attach additional paper if necessary)					
	10	Laurel E. Davis					
	11	Idavis@fclaw.com, mhurtado@fclaw.com Counsel for Bank of George					
14 [169	12	Debert D. Winne					
ENS Suite 104 3101 02) 382-11	13	Robert R. Kinas rkinas@swlaw.com, jmath@swlaw.com; mfull@swlaw.com; cdossier@swlaw.com;					
LARSON & STEPHENS Casino Center Blvd., Suite 104 Las Vegas, Nevada 89101 2) 382-1170 Fax: (702) 382-1169		lvdocket@mindspring.com; vcampbell@swlaw.com; nbaig@swlaw.com					
N & STEPHD Center Blvd., 18, Nevada 89 70 Fax: (7	14	Counsel for Housing Capital Company					
& Sy enter , Nev 0 F	15	Zachariah Larson					
LARSON 6 0 S. Casino Cel Las Vegas, (702) 382-1170	16	ecf@lslawnv.com, sstanton@lslawnv.com;akosina@lslawnv.com					
LARSO) Casino (Las Vegs 2) 382-11	17	Eleissa C. Lavelle					
.0 S. (70)	18	eclavelle@duanemorris.com, mewarkentin@duanemorris.com; sdavis@duanemorris.com Counsel for Iota White, LLC,					
81 Tel:	19	Member of Unsecured Creditors' Committee					
	20	Shawn W. Miller bankruptcyfilings@sheacarlyon.com, smiller@sheacarlyon.com;					
	21	wapplegate@sheacarlyon.com;					
	22	rmsmith@sheacarlyon.com;ltreadway@sheacarlyon.com;ewright@sheacarlyon.com Counsel for Wells Fargo Bank, N.A.					
	23	Amy N. Tirre					
	24	amy@amytirrelaw.com, admin@amytirrelaw.com					
	25	Counsel for Debtor					
	26	U.S. Trustee - LV - 11 USTPRegion17.lv.ecf@usdoj.gov					
	27						
	28	Erika M. Wright					

		Case 10-19402-lbr Doc 185 Entered 03/02/11 11:09:07 Page 9 of 10							
	1 2	ewright@sheacarlyon.com, rmsmith@sheacarlyon.com; clange@sheacarlyon.com ltreadway@sheacarlyon.com Counsel for Wells Fargo, N.A.							
	3	■ b. United States mail, postage fully prepaid							
	4	(List persons and addresses. Attach additional paper if necessary)							
	5	William N. Lobel The Lobel Firm							
	6	840 Newport Center Drive, Ste. 400							
	7	Newport Beach, CA 92660 Counsel for Debtor							
	8								
	9	James E. Till The Lobel Firm							
	10	840 Newport Center Drive, Ste. 400							
	11	Newport Beach, CA 92660 Counsel for Debtor							
HENS d., Suite 104 89101 (702) 382-1169	12	Joseph A.G. Sakay							
TS uite 1 01 1) 382	13	Hillis Clark Martin & Peterson, P.S.							
HEN vd., S a 891 (702	14	1221 Second Avenue, Suite 500 Seattle, WA 98101-2925							
STEP er Bly evads Fax:	15	Counsel for Washington Federal Savings							
LARSON & STEPHENS 810 S. Casino Center Blvd., Suite 104 Las Vegas, Nevada 89101 Tel: (702) 382-1170 Fax: (702) 382-11	16	Bank of the West							
ARSC asino s Veg 382-1	17	Jeffer Mangels Butler & Mitchell LLP							
S. C. La La 702)		c/o Walter W. Gouldsbury III Two Embarcadero Center, 5th Floor							
810 S. 1 3et: (702	18	San Francisco, CA 94111							
	19	☐ c. Personal Service (List persons and addresses. Attach additional paper if							
•	20	necessary)							
	21	I personally delivered the document(s) to the persons at these addresses:							
	22								
	23	For a party represented by an attorney, delivery was made by handing the							
	24	document(s) at the attorney's office with a clerk or other person in charge, or if no one is in charge by leaving the document(s) in a conspicuous place in the office.							
	25								
	26								
	27	For a party, delivery was made by handling the document(s) to the party or by leaving the document(s) at the person's dwelling house or usual place of abode							
	28	with someone of suitable age and discretion residing there.							
	20								

		Case 10-19402-lbr	Doc 185	Entered 03/02	/11 11:09:07	Page 10 of 10		
	1							
	2	□ d.	=	email (as opposed ns and email add	_	e ECF System) additional paper if necessa	לטי <i>ינ</i> ו	
	3	, ,	• -					
	4		Based upon the written agreement of the parties to accept service by email or a court order, I caused the document(s) to be sent to the persons at the email addresses listed below. I did not receive, within a reasonable time after the transmission, any electronic message or other indication that the transmission was unsuccessful.					
	5							
	6							
	7							
	8	│ □ e.	By fax trai	nsmission				
	9		_		ers. Attach ad	ditional paper if necessary)	
	10	•	_	_	-	accept service by fax		
_	11	1				(s) to the persons at the fax a fax machine that I used. A	1	
104 7-1169	12	сору о	of the record of the fax transmission is attached.					
er Blvd., Suite 104 evada 89101 Fax: (702) 382-1169	13							
llvd., ! la 891 :: (70	14	□ f.	By messen	ger <i>(List persons</i>	and addresses.	Attach additional paper i	f	
nter B Neva Fay	15	necessary)						
Casino Center Blvd., Suite 104 .as Vegas, Nevada 89101) 382-1170 Fax: (702) 382-11	16	•		-		elope or package addressed		
Casin Las V 2) 382	17	service	ersons at the addresses listed below and providing them to a messenger for e. (A declaration by the messenger must be attached to this Certificate of the see)					
810 S. C La Tel: (702)	18	Service						
Tel	19	I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.						
	20	Signed on (date):	March 2, 20	11				
	21							
	22	Carey Shurtlif (Name of Declarar			/s/ Carey Shur (Signature of			
	23	,	,		(Dignature of	occiurant)		
	24	LEGAL20319250.1						
	25							
	26		•					
	27							
	28							

LARSON & STEPHENS